DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 356 213 SP 034 445

AUTHOR Teddlie, Charles; And Others
TITLE Differential Characteristics of Participants in Louisiana's Model Career Option Program.
PUB DATE Sep 92
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Louisiana Evaluators (New Orleans, LA, September 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Development; Demonstration Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Mentors; *Participant Characteristics; Principals; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; Teacher Interns; Teacher Participation; *Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS *Career Options Research and Development; Louisiana; Option Weighting

ABSTRACT

The Model Career Option Program (MCOP), mandated in 1988 by the Louisiana Legislature, provided funds to pay superior teachers additional salaries for performing a variety of additional services. There were three option categories for teachers in the 1991-92 school years: (1) mentor or peer consultant; (2) supplemental teacher; and (3) staff or curriculum developer. The evaluative study reported in this paper focuses on two questions that were part of the larger study that was undertaken to provide information to policymakers at the state and local levels regarding the extent to which the goals of the program were met. The two questions more fully examined in this report are: (1) How did principals, teachers, and interns perceive the effectiveness of the program? and (2) Were there significant differences in participants' perceptions of the program depending on which of the three options was utilized? The study recommends modifications needed to operate and administer the program. Teachers, principals, and mentors were sent questionnaires to assess their attitudes toward MCOP. Statistical data derived from the questionnaires are displayed in tabular form for MCOP year 1991-92: (1) study frame and response rates; (2) rankings of mentors, interns, and principals priorities for outcomes; (3) peer consultants', teacher participants', and principals' rankings of priorities for outcomes; (4) significant differences between mentor and intern responses; (5) significant differences between peer consultants, teacher participants, and their principals; (6) significant differences between teachers in the three MCOP options; and (7) option of the mentor teachers. (LL)

Differential Characteristics of Participants in Louisiana's Model Career Option Program

Prepared by
Charles Teddlie, Louisiana State University
Carol Whelan, University of Southwestern Louisiana
Don Hoover, Independent Evaluator

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Louisiana Evaluators, New Orleans, September, 1992

Differential Characteristics of Participants in Louisiana's Model Career Option Program

Introduction

The Model Career Option Program (MCOP) was mandated by the "Children First Act" of the 1988 Louisiana Legislature and was a cornerstone of former Governor Buddy Roemer's educational reform package. This program provided funds to pay superior teachers additional salaries for performing a variety of different additional services. The purposes of MCOP as stated in Louisiana Revised Statute 17:3901 were:

1) to provide an opportunity for the teachers of this program to expand their professional horizons and explore new avenues in their roles as educators;
2) to provide teachers with meaningful career advancement;
3) to provide teachers with salary enhancements that reflect meritorious performance and advancement; and
4) to provide to school systems additional service sbased on the use of the talent of teachers.

Fcr the 1991-92 MCOP implementation year the following MCOP selection guidelines applied. The particpant must have:

1) been a practicing Louisiana public school teacher with a minimum of seven years teaching experience;
2) held a master's degree;
3) received a superior rating on his or her most recent statewide teacher evaluation.

There were three major categories of options for teachers in the 1991-92 school years, with a total of five different types of MCOP teachers: (1) Career Option One -either Mentor or

Peer Consultant; (2) Career Option Two - Supplemental Teacher; and (3) Career Option Three - Staff Developer or Curriculum Developer. More specific definitions of these options and of the number of participants selecting each in 1991-92 are as follows:

Career Option One - Teacher-to-Teacher Interaction: MCOP teachers interact with other teachers in one of the following two ways: (1) MCOP teachers work with new teachers in a Mentor role with the intent to nurture, guide, assist and support teachers entering the profession. (2) MCOP teacher works with experienced teachers in the role of Peer Consultant. The intent is to address the needs of experienced teachers who desire to strengthen their professional skills. Career Option One had 269 teachers participating in 1991-92. Of that total, 100 were mentors and 169 were peer consultants.

Career Option Two - Teacher-to-Student Interaction: MCOP teachers in this option provide supplemental instructional programs for students for an extended day, week, or school year. Activities are conducted before or after school or on Saturday. The instructional activities varied in nature ranging from remediation programs to enrichment programs and from pre-school to high school. Career Option Two had 146 participating teachers.

Career Option Three - Teacher-to-School or School District Interaction: This option involved the design and implementation of either a "staff development" or "curriculum development" program within or across a local school districts. Ninety-seven teachers participated in the project in 1991-92. Of those participating, 58 were staff developers and 39 were curriculum developers. MCOP Career Option Three activities were development efforts aimed at specific school buildings, or district level goals that are shaped by educational expectations and incorporate the talents of the MCOP teachers.

Altogether a total of 512 teachers participated in the three statewide career options in 1991-92.

Purposes of the Evaluation of MCOP and of this Study

The purpose of the evaluaiton was to provide information to decision makers at the state and local levels to assist them in making judgements about the extent to which the goals of the program have been attained. Information regarding potential modifications needed relative to operation and administration of the MCOP program were to be provided. Evaluation questions to be answered were as follows:

1. How do the benefits of the program relate to the costs?
2. What were the strengths and weaknesses of the program?
3. How did principals, teachers and interns perceive the effectiveness of the program?
4. Were there significant differences in participants' perceptions of the effectiveness of the program depending on which of the three options was utilized?
5. How might the program be improved?
6. Is there any difference in job satisfaction between those teachers who participated in the program and a comparable group not in the program?

The evaluation report (Whelan, Hoover, and Teddlie, 1992) answered these six questions. This paper concerns questions #3 and #4 above, specifically looking at differences in the characteristics of the five types of MCOP teachers to a general questionnaire designed to assess their reactions to the program.

The evaluation for school year 1990-91 was the third completed for MCOP (Whelan and Duncan, 1991; Whelan, Hoover, and Teddlie, 1991; Whelan, Hoover, and Teddlie, 1992). The

first two evaluations were of pilot programs for MCOP, while the 1990-91 evaluation assessed the first statewide implementation of the program. Ironically, funds for the statewide administration of the MCOP program (as initially designed as part of the Louisiana Teacher Evaluaton Program) were not included in the final 1992-93 state budget. While MCOP will continue in some form as a program, it will be under local control from 1992-93 onward, thus making a statewide evaluation impossible.

Methodology

Twelve separate questionnaires were developed and distributed during the Spring 1992 to assess participants' attitudes toward MCOP. These 12 questionnaires were revised versions of those used during the 1990-91 program year (Welan, Hoover & Teddlie, 1991). The 12 questionnaires included those for the five types of MCOP teachers, their principals, the Interns (who worked with Mentor), and the Teacher Participants (who worked with Peer Consultants).

Altogether, 168 questionnaires were distributed to MCOP teachers, representing one-third of the total population of those teachers. Principals of each of these 168 teachers also received a questionnaire. Additionally, the 33 Mentors in the sample had a questionnaire sent to their Interns, and the 55 Peer Consultants in the sample had a questionnaire sent to one of their Teacher Participants.

The response rates for a one-time mailing were quite high: 82.1% of the MCOP Teachers responded, 78.8% of the Interns responded, 76.4% of the Teacher Participants working with Peer Consultants responded, and 69% of the Principals responded. Typical response rates for one-time mailings of surveys is only about 40%. According to Borg and Gall (1989), response rates of this magnitude (75-80%) are typically found only after three mailings. The total MCOP

population, study sample, survey respondents, and response rates for each of the 12 questionnaires are located in Table 1.

Table 1

Study Frame and Response Rates for MCOP: Program Year 1991-92

Participant Category	Total MCOP Population	Study Sample	Survey Respondents	Response Rates
MCOP Teachers				
Mentors	100	33	29	87.9%
Peer Consultants	169	55	43	78.2%
Supplementary Instructors	146	48	42	87.5%
Staff Developers	58	20	15	75.0%
Curriculum Developers	39	12	9	75.0%
Interns and Other Teacher Participants				
Interns (work with Mentors)	100	33	26	78.8%
Teacher Participants (work with Peer Consultants)	169	55	42	76.4%
Principals				
Mentors' Principals	100	33	25	75.8%
Peer Consultants' Principals	169	55	36	65.5%
Supplementary Teachers' Principals	146	48	34	70.8%
Staff Developers' Principals	58	20	12	60.0%
Curriculum Developers' Principals	39	12	9	75.0%
Totals	**1,293**	**424**	**322**	**75.9%**

Descriptive Results

Mentor Teachers, Interns, and Principals

This group had the highest response rate, indicating a great deal of interest in MCOP. Of the Mentors, 45% were in the 31-40 age range, while 55% were in the 41-50 age range.

Eighty-six percent were female, while 62% were white. All held a Master's Degree or Master's Degree +30. The average teaching experience was 17.4 years.

The demographic characteristics of the Interns were quite different. Forty-six percent were under 25 years of age. Similar to their Mentor Teachers, 85% were female and 65% were white. Almost all held only the Bachelor's Degree. The average teaching experience was 1.35 years.

On six-point scales, with five indicating the most positive response and zero indicating the least favorite, the Mentors gave generally favorable responses ranging from a low mean of 3.44 (amount of time available to work with Intern) to 4.89 for two separate scales (I tried to make my intern feel as if he/she was an equal and valued colleague; additional compensation is extremely essential to the process of professional improvement for teachers).

The Mentors also ranked six outcomes of MCOP in order of importance (one=most important; six=least important). The top two priorities for Mentors were:

* First, allowing for the overall enhancement of teachers' salaries (average rank of 2.44);
* Second, allowing teachers more and different options for career advancement (average rank of 2.89);

The Interns also made uniformly positive responses ranging from a low mean of 3.81 (Mentor assisted in identification of district resource people) to a high mean of 4.96 (When I needed to talk to someone, I found my Mentor to be highly attentive). The Interns and their Mentors agreed with regard to overall ratings of the program, with both groups giving very high ratings.

The Intern's ranking of priorities for the MCOP program were different from their Mentors: the highest priority went to providing opportunities for teachers to engage in different professional activities (average rank of 2.36), while the lowest priority went to enhancing teachers' salaries. Thus, Interns were more interested in seeing the program provide different professional experiences, while their Mentors were more interested in salary increases.

The Mentors' Principals were also positive about the program, but the responses were not quite as positive as those of the Mentors or Interns. Their average scores ranged from a low mean of 2.40 (MCOP has resulted in better teaching in the classrooms) to a high mean of 4.32 (MCOP has increased the teachers' willingness to try new ideas).

Peer Consultants, Teacher Participants, and Consultants' Principals

Over 75% of the Peer Consultants and their Teacher Participants responded to the survey. Of the Peer Consultants, 47% were in the 31-40 age range, 39% were in the 41-50 age range, and 14% were over 50 years old. Eighty-eight percent were female, while 81% were white. The group was slight more educated than the Mentors with 51% holding the Master's Degree, 42% holding the Master's +30, and 7% holding the Specialist Degree. The average teaching experience was slightly longer than Mentors at 18 years.

The characteristics of the Teacher Participants working with the Peer Consultants were somewhat different from their typically senior colleagues. In this group, there was a wider dispersion of ages: 5% were under 25, 14% were 25-30, 29% were 31-40, 40% were 41-50, and 12% were over 50 years of age. Eighty-six percent were female, and 86% were white. The educational level of the Teacher Participants was lower than that of the Peer Consultant as 64% held the Bachelor's Degree only.

The Peer Consultants had generally positive responses to the questions concerning the MCOP program. The lowest average score (3.47) went to the amount of time the Peer Consultant was able to work with teachers, as had been the case with the Mentors. The highest average scores went to ratings of the informal daily meetings (4.60) and importance of additional compensation (4.65).

Table 2

Mentors,' Interns,' Principals,' Rankings of Priorities for MCOP Outcomes: Program Year 1991-92

Outcome	Mentor	Intern	Mentors' Principal
Provide an opportunity for recognition	4.07	3.78	3.43
Provide opportunity to engage in different professional activities	3.15	2.36	3.26
Allow more and different options for career advancement	2.89	3.48	3.13
Allow for enhancement of teachers' salaries	2.44	3.87	3.45
Provide state with more competent cadre of teachers	3.85	3.14	4.22
Provide school systems with additional services	4.04	3.61	3.30

Note: The figures in this table are the average rank for a group across all members of that group. Each member ranked the six outcomes from most important (1.0) to least important (6.0).

The Peer Consultants' rating of the services provided to their colleagues was positive (4.16), but not quite as high as that of Mentors (4.62). Rankings of the priorities for MCOP outcomes ranged from a high priority rank of 2.6 (allowing more and different options for career advancement; allowing for enhancement of teachers' salaries) to a low priority rank of 4.8 (providing school systems with additional services). (see Table 3).

The Teacher Participants working with the Peer Consultants had positive responses to the MCOP questionnaire. The lowest rating went to the item concerning the Consultants' assistance

in locating resource people in the district (3.68): this had also been the lowest rated item for the Interns. The highest rated item was that given to the overall assistance provided by the Peer Consultant (4.66).

The Teachers Participants' rankings of priorities for MCOP outcomes were quite different from their Peer Consultants.' The two highest ranked priorities for the Teacher Participants were providing the state with a more competent cadre of teachers (2.85) and providing school systems additional services (2.79). Allowing more and different options for career advancement (3.23) and allowing the enhancement of teacher salaries (3.10) were not as highly rated.

The responses of the Peer Consultants' Principals were not as positive as those of the Consultants or the Teacher Participants, nor were they as positive as those of the Mentors' Principals. The overall ranking of the program (3.69) was the lowest of any group described thus far.

Table 3

Peer Consultants,' Teacher Participants,' and Consultants' Principals' Rankings of Priorities for MCOP Outcomes: Program Year 1991-92

Outcome	Peer Consultant	Teacher Participant	Consultants' Principal
Provide an opportunity for recognition	4.34	3.82	3.91
Provide opportunity to engage in different professional activities	3.07	3.11	2.91
Allow more and different options for career advancement	2.64	3.23	3.41
Allow for enhancement of teachers' salaries	2.59	3.10	2.88
Provide state with more competent cadre of teachers	3.38	2.85	4.09
Provide school systems with additional services	4.78	2.79	3.30

NOTE: The figures in this table are the average rank for a group across all members of that group. Each member ranked the six outcomes from most important (1.0) to least important (6.0).

Supplemental Teachers and Their Principals

The Supplemental Teachers were the oldest and most experienced of any of the MCOP teacher groups. Eighty-three percent were female, while 67% were white. Fifty percent held Master's Degrees and 45% held Master's Degrees +30. The average teaching experience was 19.4 years for this group, with a standard deviation of 5.3 years.

As with all MCOP teacher groups, the general responses of the Supplemental Teachers to the program were positive. The responses ranged from a low mean of 3.5 (the amount of support I have received from the Central Office is adequate; due to MCOP, my ability to employ new teaching strategies has improved) to a high mean ov 4.55 (students have benefitted from this program). The Supplemental Teachers ranked improved self-concept as the greatest benefit of the program for students.

The patterns of responses to the rankings of priority for MCOP outcomes was different for the Supplemental Teachers as opposed to the Mentors and Peer Consultants. While the latter two groups hadn't ranked providing school systems with additional services very highly, this as the first priority for the Supplemental Teachers (2.51).

The Supplemental Teachers' Principals' ratings of the program were positive, but less so than those for the teachers. The lowest rated item was, in fact, below the mid-point of 2.5: Supplemental Teachers' Principals disagreed (average score of 1.82) with the statement that participation in MCOP had resulted in better teaching in the classrooms. This comparative question may have resulted in weak findings because the Supplemental Teachers' Principals felt their teachers were very good even before the MCOP program started. The Supplemental Teachers' Principals agreed that improved self-concept (average rank of 2.26 of 6 options) was

the greatest benefit for the students participating in the program.

Staff Developers and Their Principals.

The lowest response rates to the surveys came from Staff Developers and their Principals. Seventy-five percent of the Staff Developers returned the questionnaires, while one 65% of their Principals did so. (See Table 1).

Forty percent of Staff Developers were aged 31-40, another 47% were 41-50, and 13% were more than 50 years of age. Ninety-three percent were females, and 87 percent were white. The proportion of white females for this category is higher than that for any group except Curriculum Developers, who will be described later. Forty percent of this group held Master's Degrees, another 40% had Master's Degrees +30, while the final 20% had a Specialist Degree. The average teaching experience was 17.1 years.

The responses of Staff Developers to the MCOP questionnaires were very positive, with scores on all but one item averaging more than four points on the maximum of five-point scales. The lowe' ra'ing (average score of 3.87) was for the item asking if the staff development program had helped participants in their daily planning and preparation. The highest rating went to school administration support (4.8).

When asked how they chose the content addressed in the staff development activities (an item allowing multiple responses), 80% indicated direction from their principals, and 67% noted a needs assessment. As with Supplemental Teachers, the Staff Developers ranked the provision of school systems with additional services as their highest priority (average rank of 2.80).

As has been the case with several other groups, the Staff Developers' Principals' ratings

of the MCOP program were lower than those of their teachers. As with the Supplemental Teachers' Principals, the Staff Developers' Principals mildly disagreed (average rating of 2.08) with the statement that the MCOP staff development program had resulted in better teaching in the classroom. The highest ratings went to the statement that read, "my efforts to provide ... opportunities for MCOP teachers ... to communicate with my office were very successful" (average rating = 4.25). The Staff Developers' Principals' overall rating of the program was 3.75, which was lower than that of the Developers' themselves.

Curriculum Developers and Their Principals

Curriculum Developers had the following age characteristics: 44% were 31-40, 44% were 41-50, and the remainder were more than 50 years of age. This group was very homogeneous, with 89% being female and 100% being white. Sixty-seven percent had Master's Degrees +30, while the remainder had Master's Degrees. The average teaching experience was 18.4 years.

The Curriculum Developers also had quite positive responses to the MCOP questionnaires. Only two items had mean scores below four: the provision of clear and accurate information (3.78) and the effect that participation in curriculum development had on teachers' commitment to students (3.89). The teachers strongly agreed with the following statements: participation in the project has made me a better teacher (4.89) and the curriculum development program at my school was very helpful (4.89).

As for how the content of the curriculum development activities was developed (an item allowing multiple responses), 67% said needs assessments, 67% said informational input from peers, and 56% said direction from the principal. The highest ranked MCOP outcome for Staff Developers was providing the opportunity to engage in additional professional activities (average

rank = 2.89), while the lowest priority was providing the opportunity for recognition (4.78).

The responses of the Curriculum Developers' Principals were generally positive, although somewhat less so than their teachers. Again, the lowest ranked item (once more, less than midpoint of the scale), concerned whether or not the MCOP program had resulted in better teaching in the classrooms: most of the principals disagreed with this statement (average score = 1.78). On all other items, the Curriculum Developers' Principals gave positive responses; for instance, they agreed that participation in the program increased the teachers' willingness and ability to try new ideas (average score = 4.0). The Curriculum Developers' Principals' overall rating of the program was 3.78, which was lower than that for their teachers. This is a pattern that was found throughout the study, in which participating teachers rated their programs more effective than did their principals.

Statistical Comparisons Within MCOP Option Groups

The previous discussion highlighted mean differences within MCOP option groups, such as those between Mentors, Interns, and Mentors' Principals. This section of the report will include statistical tests of these differences

The statistical test employed throughout these analyses is Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). F-values are reported in Tables 4, 5, and 6. All reported significant differences at the $p < .05$ level minimum. All ANOVAs reported are one-way (i.e., involve one independent variable).

Differences Between Mentors, Interns, and Their Principals

Most significant differences among these three groups occurred between Mentors and Interns (See Table 4). There were several significant demographic differences between Mentors and their Interns as was to be expected. Mentors were older, more highly educated, and had

more teaching experiences than did their Interns.

As noted above, both Mentors and Interns rated all aspects of MCOP positively, but the Interns' ratings were often higher. As noted in Table 4, Interns had significantly more positive responses than Mentors to the following items: adequacy of time to work together, the establishment of a good learning environment in the classroom, modification of teachers strategies as needed, etc.

Table 4

Significant Differences Between Mentors' and Interns' Responses to MCOP Survey Questionnaires, 1991-92			
Item	Mentors' Mean Response	Interns' Mean Response	F Value
The amount of time available to work with my assigned intern (mentor) was adequate.	3.45	4.42	12.00***
I (my mentor) helped to establish a good learning environment in the classroom.	4.13	4.62	5.60*
I (my mentor) helped my intern (me) to modify teaching strategies when needed.	3.83	4.42	7.47**
My intern (I) would rate the overall assistance provided by me (to me as Intern) as highly competent.	4.62	4.88	5.34*
My intern (I) would rate me (my mentor) as superior in the demonstration of classroom skills.	4.39	4.77	4.26*
Ranking of priority of importance of salary enhancements as a MCOP outcome.	2.44	3.87	12.45***

NOTE: For all items except those concerning the priority of MCOP outcomes, the scale values range from 0 (most negative) to 5 (most positive). For MCOP outcome priority items, the scale values range from 1 (highest priority) to 6 (lowest priority).
* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

The mean score for Interns across those five scales was above 4.5, which is in the upper

range of positivity of response. In fact, across all groups across all options, Interns gave the most uniformly positive responses. These young teachers, most just emerging from their undergraduate education programs, were exposed on a one-to-one basis with the best teachers in the state. The value of this exposure, plus the optimism of youth, resulted in these extremely positive ratings.

There was one area regarding the importance of MCOP outcomes on which Mentors and Interns differed significantly: the importance of the program allowing for the overall enhancement of teaching salaries. Mentors rated this outcome as their first priority and also rated it significantly higher than did their Interns, who rated the opportunity to engage in different professional activities first. This difference in priorities reflects the demographic differences noted above: the Mentors are much more experienced than the Interns and have entered a phase of their careers where salary is more important than engaging in different professional activities. For their Interns, who have just started teaching and who are younger and have fewer financial burdens, the value of additional professional experience is greater than that of extra money.

Differences Between Peer Consultants, Their Teacher Participants, and Their Principals

Looking first at differences just between Peer Consultants and their Teacher Participants, there are some demographic differences: Peer Consultants are more educated and experienced than their Teacher Participants. These differences are a function of the homogeneity of the Peer Consultant group as opposed to the heterogeneity of their Teacher Participant group.

There were a few non-demographic differences between these two groups of teachers. Teacher participants were more likely to report that their was adequate time for working with their Peer Consultant, while their Consultants were less inclined to agree. This result replicates the difference between Mentors and their Interns. Mentors and Peer Consultants feel more

pressed for time than their colleagues because they are the ones who must organize the conferences and budget the time.

Table 5

Significant Differences Between Peer Consultants,' Teacher Participants,' and Their Principals to MCOP Survey Questionnaire: 1991-92				
Item	Peer Consultants' Response	Teacher Participants' Response	Principals' Response	F Value
Percentage indicating MCOP cannot provide teachers with more and different options.	5.0%	15.0%	0%	3.59*
Percentage indicating MCOP cannot enhance salaries.	0.0%	10.0%	0%	4.11*
Ranking of priority of importance of providing more and different options for MCOP outcomes.	2.64	3.23	3.41	2.97*
Ranking of priority of importance of providing a competent code cadre of teachers.	3.38	2.85	4.09	4.52*
Ranking of priority of importance of providing additional services as a MCOP outcome.	4.78	2.79	3.30	3.01*

NOTE: For MCOP outcome priority items, the scale values range from 1 (highest priority) to 6 (lowest priority).
* $p < .05$

Similar differences to those described earlier for Mentors/Interns occurred for Peer Consultants/Teacher Participants on prioritizing MCOP outcomes. More Teacher Participants did not believe MCOP could enhance salaries than did Peer Consultants. Also, Teacher Participants ranked the MCOP outcome of providing additional service to the school system as a higher priority than did Peer Consultants. As was the case with Mentors/Interns, Peer Consultants prioritized salary enhancements and options for career advancement higher than did Teacher Participant, while Teacher Participants prioritized MCOP service components higher than did Peer Consultants. These differences are probably due to role differences.

Statistically significant differences among all three groups in this option (Peer Consultant, their Teacher Participants, and their Principals) are summarized in Table 5. More Teacher Participants did not believe that MCOP could provide teachers with more and different options (15%) or with enhanced salaries (10%). While statistically significant, these percentages are low and may simply reflect a few Teacher Participants who are unaware of the MCOP reward system.

Differences Between Supplemental Teachers and Their Principals

As noted in Table 6, Supplemental Teachers are more likely to indicate that they have become better teachers as a result of MCOP than are their Principals. This result is statistically significant and in the same direction as that for Staff Developers and Curriculum Developers. Three alternative explanations for this consistent finding across options emerged:

1) MCOP Teachers, who are more directly involved in the program and who observe their own teaching day in and day out, are more likely to see improvement than are their principals.

2) MCOP Principals may already perceive their teacher as excellent (their ratings of the teachers was one factor in the teachers' MCOP designation) and a ceiling effect may occur, such that "improvement" is hard for a principal to perceive.

3) MCOP Principals may rate all survey questionnaire items, and particularly those concerning teaching improvement, lower than teachers because they are slightly irritated that their "best" teachers are spending extra energy on MCOP activities rather than on other special assignments.

Supplemental teachers were also more likely to strongly agree that students had benefitted

from MCOP than were their principals (See Table 6A), although both groups made very positive responses to this item. Similarly, Supplemental Teachers ranked improved self-concept (average rank of 1.66 for 6 options) significantly higher than did their principals (average rank of 2.26).

Staff Developers and Their Principals

There were several significant differences between Staff Developers and their Principals on the questionnaire. In all cases, the Staff Developer had a more positive response toward the program than the Principal. As noted in Table 6B, Staff Developers believed that they had received better and more MCOP accurate information than did their Principals. Staff Developers also believed that the central office had been more supportive of MCOP than was the Principal, a result that was replicated for the Curriculum Developers (See Table 6C). It is interesting that teachers who are below Principals in the district chain of command perceive the central office as more supportive. The Staff Developers rated three other items more highly than did their Principals: the increase in their commitment to students as a result of MCOP, their improvement in teaching as a result of MCOP, and their overall rating of the program.

Curriculum Developers and Their Principals

These groups differ on three items that form a pattern across MCOP options: the degree of central office support; their improvement in teaching as a result of MCOP; and their overall rating of the program. In all cases, as in all cases in other options, the Curriculum Development teacher made more positive responses to these items than did their principals.

Table 6

Significant Differences Between Teachers in Three MCOP Options (Supplemental, Staff Development, Curriculum Development) and Their Principals:
Responses to MCOP Survey Questionnaires, 1991-92

Item	Supplemental Teachers' Response	Their Principals' Response	F Value
Table 6A			
I believe my (my teacher's) participation in MCOP has made me a better teacher	3.86	3.18	4.13*
Students have benefitted from this program	4.55	4.18	4.63*
Ranking of benefit of improved self-concept as a result of being in MCOP	1.66	2.26	4.45**
Table 6B			
Item	Staff Developers' Response	Their Principals' Response	F-Value
I found information about the goals and purpose of MCOP to be clear and accurate	4.33	3.50	5.69*
As a result of MCOP, the teachers' commitment to students has increased	4.27	3.58	5.62*
Central office support has been adequate	4.53	3.50	8.58**
I believe my (my teachers') participation in MCOP has made me (him/her) a better teacher	4.73	2.92	19.75**
I rate the program as excellent	4.47	3.75	4.28*
Table 6C			
Item	Curriculum Developers' Response	Their Principals' Response	F-Value
Central office support has been adequate	4.56	3.22	7.20
I believe my (my teachers') participation in MCOP has made me (him/her) a better teacher	4.89	3.22	13.85**
I rate the program as excellent	4.89	3.78	13.79**

NOTE: For all items except those ranking the benefits of the Supplemental Teachers' option, the scale values range from 0 (most negative) to 6 (most positive). For the benefit ranking item, scale values from 1 (most beneficial) to 6 (least beneficial). Scores on the item concerning improvement as a teacher were recoded so that larger numbers indicated a more positive response.

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

Qualitative Analysis of Open-Ended Question

The last section of the survey was composed of three open-ended questions to which the respondents wrote comments. One question asked for an opinion of the program strengths, another ased for weaknesses and the third for suggestions for program improvement.

The method used for analyzing these responses is the constant comparative technique (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). All of the answers to a question were read and broken into separate, discernible responses through a process called unitizing. Each unit was then numbered and separated from the questionnaire. A separate stack of responses was made for each of the questions. This stack of responses was then divided into piles based on similarity.

Due to space constraints, the responses to only one question (that concerning the strengths of MCOP) will be presented in this paper. Table 7 summarizes these reponses by option.

The most commly stated strength overall was for sharing knowledge with others (31% across all options). This was also the most commonly stated strength for three groups: Mentors, Peer Consultants, and Staff Developers. For Supplemental Teachers, the most commonly stated strength was helping students, while for Curriculum Developers it was "recognizing superior teachers."

Mentor and Peer Consultant responses were more alike, while there were also similarities among the responses of Supplementary Teachers, Staff Developers, and Curriculum Developers. The teachers associated with Options Two and Three (Supplemental Teachers, Staff Developers, Curriculum Developers) were more concerned with MCOP services to the system (improves school or system) than those associated with Option One (Mentors, Peer Consultants), who tended to be more oriented toward rewards for themselves. Returning to the closed-ended items for a

moment, the difference in mean scores for MCOP teachers on the importance of salary enhancement illustrates the latter point further: Mentors averaged 2.44; Peer Consultants, 2.64; Staff Developers, 2.87; Supplemental Teachers, 3.15; and Curriculum Developers, 3.33.

Table 7

Option of Mentor Teacher						
Strength	Mentor	Peer Consultant	Supplementary Teacher	Staff Developers	Curriculum Developers	Average* Across All Options
Share Knowledge	39%	48%	25%	46%	0%	31%
Increases Salaries	14%	12%	8%	12%	13%	12%
Recognizes Superior Teachers	6%	4%	7%	0%	27%	9%
Helps Students	4%	0%	33%	0%	7%	9%
Improves School or System	0%	0%	8%	12%	20%	8%
Promotes Professional Growth	18%	4%	0%	0%	13%	7%
Increases Staff Collegiality	0%	12%	0%	0%	13%	5%
Improves Teachers' Self-Esteem	4%	0%	0%	19%	0%	4%
Keeps Good Teachers in Classrooms	4%	6%	3%	0%	0%	3%
Professionally Run by LDE	6%	0%	3%	0%	0%	2%
Eases Interns' Isolation	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Opportunity to Work with Families	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	1%
Other	0%	14%	10%	12%	7%	8%

NOTE. This average is unweighted by the number of observations. It is simply an average across the 5 option types.

References

Borg, W. & Gall, M. (1989). Educational research. New York: Longman.

Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Whelan, C. & Duncan, B. (1991). An evaluation of Louisiana's 1989-90 Model Career Options Program for teachers. ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education (ED323199).

Whelan C., Hoover, D., & Teddlie C. (1991). Final Evaluation Report of the 1990-91 Model Career Options Program. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State Department of Education, Bureau of Accountability.

Whelan, C. Hoover, D., & Teddlie, C. (1992). Interim Evaluation Report for the 1991-92 Model Career Options Program. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State Department of Education, Bureau of Accountability.